

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Amend claims 1, 8-9, 19, 35-36, 47, 51, 53-57, 59 and 61-62.
2. Thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 43.
3. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.
4. Petition for a Two Month Extension of Time.

B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9 and 12-15, 17-19, 22, 23, 25, 31-33, 36-37, 39-42, 47, 49 and 50 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,214 to Nanbudiri et al. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,199,753 to Tracy et al and still further in view of U.S. Patent 6,157,005 to Lu. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,199,753 to Tracy et al and still further in view of U.S. Patent 4,673,932 to Ekchain et al. Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,199,753 to Tracy et al. Claims 16, 28 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,696,366 to Ziarno. Claims 21, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC

§103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,397,882 to Van Solt. Claims 29, 30, 44-46, 48, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61 and 62 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,468,942 to Oosterveen et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,164,546 to Kumagai et al and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,214 to Nambudiri et al. All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The applied prior art fails to teach or suggest features of Applicant's independent claims including the amendatory limitation now presented that the terminal cradles or compartment are all housed in a same and single substantially flat portion of the housing for the terminals.

Oosterveen discloses a dispensing device having a rack 2 with a plurality of columns 3 through 9, each column having two sides extending transversally to the plane of the paper on opposite sides of the column and each side being provided with a holder for a number of hand scanners. The rack is accessible from two sides (see column 2, lines 4-8 and 35). Clearly, Oosterveen discloses a dispensing device wherein the compartments (holders) for the terminals (hand scanners) are housed on two opposite sides of each column of the rack. Differently, Applicant's amended independent claims requires that the compartments are all housed in a same and single flat portion of the dispenser housing.

The arrangement of all the compartments in a same and single flat portion of the housing for the terminals renders Applicant's dispenser extremely compact and functional and facilitates easy and quicky identification and withdrawal operation of the terminals assigned to the identified customer. These advantages are not achievable with the dispenser of Oosterveen, wherein the compartments are housed in a plurality of columns

and on opposite faces of each column. In view of the above, the independent claims of the referred application as now amended are novel and non obvious over Oosterveen.

Kumagai discloses an optical reader capable of reading a bar code of an article in a mounted state and in a hand-held state. Kumagai discloses that the optical reader can be mounted in a specific holding member 2. However, Kumagai does not disclose any dispenser of the optical reader nor holding members which are all housed in a same and single flat portion of a dispenser.

Further, no mention is found throughout Nambudiri and Tracy that the cradles for the portable terminals are all housed in a same and single flat portion of the terminal dispenser unit.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application, including but not limited to extension of time fees.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

BOTTAZZI et al.
Serial No. 09/657,519

Atty Dkt: 3572-21
Art Unit: 3653

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100